

***Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/762,784	CHILDERS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JACQUELINE DIRAMIO	1641	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED **14 October 2009** FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
 See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.

/Bao-Thuy L. Nguyen/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1641
 November 3, 2009

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons presented in the previous office action. Further, Applicant's additional arguments (see pages 9-10) presented within the provided response, which have been fully considered, have not been found persuasive. Applicant argues that the information or words that can be encoded onto the test strip of Groll is not the same as the different calibration values recited within Applicant's independent claims. This argument is not found persuasive because the "at least one calibration value" recited within the instant claims is a broad limitation and therefore, the different information discussed by Groll that can be encoded directly onto their test strip would read on this broad limitation. In addition, Groll teaches the encoding of calibration codes directly onto the test strip device, which in turn would be related to the chemical reagent provided on the test strip device, and therefore, these calibration codes would read on Applicant's "at least one calibration value" (see paragraphs [0061], [0065]-[0074]). Finally, it is noted that the Groll reference includes all of the structural elements required by the independent claim(s), except for the use of impedance elements, wherein the impedance elements comprise a plurality of impedance elements that are arranged in a particular configuration. These additional elements were remedied by the Burke et al. and Ward references, which were combined with Groll in the previously applied 103(a) rejection. Therefore, given that the combination Groll in view of Burke et al. and Ward teaches all of the structural elements required by Applicant's blood test device, the combination is capable of performing the intended use recited by Applicant's independent claims of producing the at least one calibration value. Therefore, for all of these reasons discussed above, the 103(a) rejection over the claims as being unpatentable over Groll in view of Burke et al. and Ward is maintained.